

REMARKS

In response to the Advisory Action dated November 7, 2006, Applicant hereby submits this Request for Continued Examination. Because the Examiner noted that Applicant's Reply and Amendment of October 13, 2006 to the Office Action of August 28, 2006 was not entered into the record, Applicant has included that Amendment herein and also included its Remarks below responsive to the Office Action of August 28, 2006.

Applicant has cancelled claims 53 and 54 to comply with the Examiner's requirement for an election. Although, applicant does not agree with the Examiner that an election is required for these claims as previously submitted, applicant is canceling these claims to comply with the Examiner's requirement. Applicant reserves the right to file an additional application to address the subject matter of these claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 46, 52 and 58-62 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US/6,234,240 to Cheon (Cheon). The Examiner maintains that he is entitled to group Cheon's heat transfer unit 22 and peltier device 14 as a single component. The Examiner further argues that Applicant has not claimed the direction of electron flow (and heat flow) specifically to distinguish from Cheon.

Although Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner's arguments, Applicant has amended claim 46 and 62 to clearly traverse the Examiner's arguments with respect to Cheon. Specifically, claims 46 and 62 as amended now clearly recite the transfer of heat along the larger (than the depth) length or width dimension of the electron conducting material operating under the peltier effect. Cheon (in Fig. 3, for example) clearly depict the transfer of heat as along the (smaller) depth dimension of their peltier devices. Applicant has clearly depicted in its application, the transfer of heat along the larger (length or width) dimensions of its electron conducting material (e.g. peltier device).

Consequently, Applicant submits that this amendment to claim 46 traverses the Examiner's arguments with respect to Cheon and puts the claim in conditon for allowance. Since claims 52 and 58-61 all depend on claim 46 as amended, Applicant submits that these claims are also in conditon for allowance.

Additionally, Applicant has added dependent claims 63 and 64 which each add a negative limitation citing the elimination of the housing (as shown as element 22 in Cheon, for example) and typically referred to as the heat transfer unit. Applicants submit that this negative limitation also traverses the Examiner's argument of combining Cheon's heat transfer unit 22 and peltier device 14 into a single component. Consequently, Applicant submits that these claims are also in conditon for allowance.

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claims 47-51 and 55-57 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cheon in view of Law et al (US/6,711,904), Applicants does not agree with the Examiner's arguments for the reasons previously stated. Nevertheless, Applicants submits that since these claims all depend directly or indirectly on Claim 46 as amended, they are in conditon for allowance. Applicant also wishes to point out that Law does not teach or suggest the transfer of heat along the larger length or width dimension of the peltier devices, but along the smaller depth dimension as depicted in Law.

Applicant respectfully submits then, that all of its claims now in this application are in condition for allowance.


Should the Examiner have any further comments or issues, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *art.fisher@patentdominion.net*

App. No. 10/715,322
November 13, 2006 RCE responsive
Advisory Action mailed November 07, 2006

Docket No. QNX003

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov. 13, 2006



Arthur W. Fisher
Registration No. 27,549
Patent Dominion LP
555 Republic Drive, Suite 200
Plano, Texas 75075
(972) 788-1336/telephone
(972) 788-1335/facsimile